

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Cynthia Schnaitmann [cynthiaschnaitmann@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2006 2:59 PM

To: KJMWEB

Subject: A la Carte television

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

I support pay television being "a la carte". I hate paying for what I don't want.

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

cindy

No. of Copies rec'd 041
List ABOVE

5/5/2006

Sandralyn Bailey

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL 04-207

From: Steve Wilhelm [srwilhelm@cox.net]

Sent: Monday, April 11, 2005 4:23 PM

To: dtaylor@ateweb

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner,

Is it more expensive to buy two dozen apples or fifteen dozen apples?

The cable industry's lobbyists would like you to believe that the answer cannot be determined without volumes of data. My view is that any third grader would know the answer. Further, to have the FCC or any other government agency spend money on a study of this would be fiscal negligence. I'm sure the industry has already provided you with their data, which is probably not worth the paper it is printed on. I cannot tell you how draining it is to the average person to see the continuous manipulation of the mechanism of government regulation to the benefit of fat big business at our expense.

The recent stories about the cable industry lobbyist's efforts to fault the FCC's recommendations to move to a la carte pricing would illustrate that they don't think congress has the common sense of a third grader. I won't get into this particular area, but I do hope you will persevere in your effort to help the American consumer.

Your efforts are appreciated. Thank you.

Steven R. Wilhelm

No. of Copies rec'd 041
List / CODE

5/5/2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Vince Weeks [Vince.Weeks@us.tadpole.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 13, 2006 1:20 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Individual channel ordering

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I would like to be able to order cable TV channels ala carte. I'm tired of paying for "product" that I don't use.

Vince Weeks

Geospatial Solutions Division
Tadpole Technology Group
2231 Faraday Avenue
Suite 140
Carlsbad, CA 92008, USA
vince.weeks@us.tadpole.com
+1 (760) 929 8345 ext 121
Lat: 33.1337 Long: -117.2788

No. of Copies rec'd 041
List AS-COE

5/5/2006

Sandra Lyn Bailey

04-207

From: smerka [stm4542@sbcglobal.net]
 Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 3:15 PM
 To: KJMWEB
 Cc: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratweb
 Subject: Unbundling Cable/Satellite TV

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Chairman Martin & Commissioners Copps, Adelstein and Tate - -

Well, I just received my latest Direct TV bill with another \$3 increase. It seems to happen about this same time every year. I have no say in these price increases, and when I call to inquire..."oh well, that's the price of doing business."

As I "surf" through the umpteen channels that I receive, I ask myself at each channel selection, "why do I need this crappy channel?" Again I have no say in what hand (channel) I am dealt...just here it is...like it or else!"

Example #1 = Mexican channels. At one time there maybe was one...then another...now there are 5 ! I don't watch these but had no say on the adding to my available channels.

Example #2 = Home Shopping Channels. I don't shop this way and don't watch these emotionally appealing sucker shows that make one think they just can't get along without it. Yet I have 10 of these channels forced upon me and I had no choice...no say.

Example #3 = Golf Channel. Now there is one that I want, but it does not come with my "package." When I asked if I could trade the above 15 channels for the 1 golf channel...well, it doesn't work that way but for \$5 - \$10 more per month, they can fix me up...15 to 1...why can't I trade 15 junk channels for 1 that is important to me at no additional cost?

I like my local Houston, TX area channels, some of the sports channels, some of the free movie related channels, most of the cable news/weather/talk channels and several of the religious channels. Since I just categorized some of the groupings, why can't the cable/satellite guys do it to a more specific degree? Let me build my "choices" as I go down the "channel cafeteria line" to end up at the cash register with what I want to eat and the cost I want to pay. This could be structured so that if I wanted "4 meats" then I get no salad nor dessert, or if I want all dessert, then I get no meat nor vegetables. I control my choices and have no one to blame but myself for those choices. **It is not that complicated !**

No, it is not complicated but the entrenched cable/satellite gurus don't want to be bothered with unbundling...a la carte...customer choice. They want their convenience/price increases to come first and customer satisfaction is last ! After spending almost 40 years in the utility and energy industry, I have seen overly protective and stale companies realize they need to "think outside the box" and waahlah...there are cellular telephones with cameras/other doo-dads and available electrical power that comes from where the customer shops. Why should the cable/satellite industry be any different?

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
 RECEIVED
 MAY - 5 2006
 Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

04/1

Families can choose their cable/satellite friendly programing tiers according to their family values, folks can pay extra for their "excessive cafeteria plan choice", cable/satellite gurus can see what customers choose versus what those gurus think we need/cram down our throats, if prices increase (?) then folks can "pare down their selections" to reduce monthly budgets and overall we don't buy nor pay for what we don't want or need! Goofy Mark Cuban, one of our TX basketball team owners and Dallas court jester, is wrong...wrong...wrong by saying "if a la carte happens, everybody loses." What Cuban and the other gurus are doing in effect is to limit free speech through "force feeding" us what is convenient to him/them instead of choice/price shopping for us.

Please give this your utmost consideration. **If you don't act, neither will the gurus !**

Respectfully,
A Houston Area Customer

☒ FREE emoticons for your email! [click Here!](#)

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: scottcooper [scottcooper@prodigy.net]
Sent: Thursday, April 06, 2006 11:50 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Thank you!
Importance: High

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Martin:

I'm the father of three, past and current member of education and drug boards in Sonoma County, California, and author of a few national parenting books. I've written you before to urge you as strongly as I can to champion regulation that would help protect children from adult TV entertainment.

Thank you very much for all of your recent efforts. I applaud you for putting pressure on the cable and satellite TV industries to provide family-family programming options. I also express my support for your efforts to open up the opportunity for a-la-carte programming. This not only benefits my immediate family, it will have long-term benefit to our society as a whole.

Do you also have influence over the Internet industry? If so, **I would also implore you to initiate regulations that require Internet Service Providers (ISPs) to offer at least one option that is screened to protect minors from pornography and other inappropriate sites.**

If this is out of your jurisdiction, I'd greatly appreciate your letting me know who I can contact about this issue.

Thank you for your great efforts and service on behalf of all of us.

Regards,

Scott Cooper
 Petaluma, CA
 707-765-9571

No. of Copies rec'd
 List/ASODE

041

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: Chris Hall [cjhall1976@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2006 4:43 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chris Hall (cjhall1976@yahoo.com) writes:

I'm from Grand Rapids, Michigan and I have one option for cable television, Comcast. Why on Earth should I be punished because "small cable channels" need "protection" from the free market? We need ala cart pricing for cable TV. \$80 a month to watch the 3-5 channels I need to catch the news or my favorite sports teams? That is insanity and it needs to be fixed soon. I could almost live with the current highway robbery, except that I can't choose to go to the competition because Comcast has a monopoly on cable television in my area. What is the FCC doing to fix this joke of a telecom monopoly?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.11.43.180
Remote IP address: 24.11.43.180

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 041
List ABCDE

SandraLyn Bailey

04-207

From: Ann Alberstadt [aalberstadt@alston.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 9:30 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ann Alberstadt (aalberstadt@alston.com) writes:

Mr. Martin, I am so thankful that you have the wisdom to see through what the four major TV networks are trying to do with regards to holding parents responsible for what is broadcast in their homes. Both my husband and I have tried everything we can to block channels that show programs inappropriate for our child and IT DOES NOT WORK!!! As parents, we feel the best way to deal with this issue at this time, is being given a la carte choices. I am asking that you please move forward on this issue as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Ann Alberstadt
Fayetteville, GA

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.192.134.245
Remote IP address: 66.192.134.245

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 081
List ABCDE

SandraLyn Bailey

04-207

From: Mary Jo McConnell [fritz1992@yahoo.com]**Sent:** Wednesday, April 05, 2006 12:52 PM**To:** KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan.Adelsein@fcc.gov; dtayloratweb**Subject:** Ala cart programing**RECEIVED**

MAY - 5 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Readers;

I am writing to complain about the cable and satellite industry and the lack of choice of ala cart programming.

I have to take 100 channels, which is very costly, in order to get the dozen channels I watch. I do not need or want the remaining 88. Why do I have to pay for them?

This practice is for the benefit of the industry, not the consumer.

Because of the high heating and gasoline costs, I am now forced to cancel my cable. The cost of \$60.00 per month is just to high a price for the few channels I watch.

The satellite industry is just as bad. Requirements that force me to take and pay for programming that I do not watch.

I know that this argument has been on going. The cable industry always gets what it wants. When will the consumer be first in the considerations of our government commissions?

Mary Jo McConnell

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

No. of Copies rec'd 041
List ASCUE

5/5/2006

Sandra Lyn Bailey

04-207

From: Ryan Raggio [Raggio85@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2006 11:48 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Ryan Raggio (Raggio85@aol.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,
I would like to simply state that I agree fully with you're stance on TV indecency, and support your efforts to promote "a la carte" programming. Some individuals seem to enjoy such pervasive violence, profanity and sex entering their households. I do not, and I appreciate your efforts concerning such matters. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Ryan Raggio

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.44.62.91
Remote IP address: 68.44.62.91

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd
LIST ABOVE

041

Sandralyn Bailey

104-207

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Sharon Thompson [sdtbiz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 3:41 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Sharon Thompson (sdtbiz@yahoo.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,

With regard to your recent interest in instituting "tiered" television programming I would like to make a timely suggestion. I would like to suggest that all foreign-language programming be placed on a separate tier so that English-speaking consumers, who have absolutely no use for foreign-language channels, are not forced to pay for such programming as part of basic cable, etc. This should be considered specialty programming, not basic, and could be tiered separately at a price-point equivalent to "basic plus". That said, I also support your a la carte suggestion.

Thank you for your time.

S. Thompson

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 67.103.247.81
Remote IP address: 67.103.247.81

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 041
LIST ABOVE

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: Teri Stubblefield [tuteri@txued.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 3:06 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Teri Stubblefield (tuteri@txued.com) writes:

Chairman Martin. Thank you for your effort to unbundle cable & satellite TV. We have needed someone to standup against the filth in America for a long time. thanks for being the one ...

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 206.227.128.13
Remote IP address: 206.227.128.13

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 081
List ASCDE

Sandra Lyn Bailey

04-207
RECEIVED

From: N Mabry [nmabry@atlantic.net]
Sent: Saturday, April 08, 2006 11:25 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: MTV

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Martin:

I really resent having to pay a blanket fee for cable which includes supporting such channels as MTV which promotes illicit and immoral behavior.

I didn't realize that even though I don't watch it, my money goes to support it's programming. I do not wish to support any such morally decaying programs. Four letter words, sexual gyrations, and the like are not in keeping with my moral views. It should be X-rated and should not be included with basic cable.

Please do something about this.
Thanks you very much.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 0 4 /
LIST ABOVE

5/5/2006

Sandra Lyn Bailey

04-207

From: Mary Jo McConnell [fritz1992@yahoo.com]**Sent:** Wednesday, April 05, 2006 12:52 PM**To:** KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan.Adelsein@fcc.gov; dtayloratateweb**Subject:** Ala cart programing**RECEIVED**

MAY - 5 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Readers;

I am writing to complain about the cable and satellite industry and the lack of choice of ala cart programming.

I have to take 100 channels, which is very costly, in order to get the dozen channels I watch. I do not need or want the remaining 88. Why do I have to pay for them?

This practice is for the benefit of the industry, not the consumer.

Because of the high heating and gasoline costs, I am now forced to cancel my cable. The cost of \$60.00 per month is just to high a price for the few channels I watch.

The satellite industry is just as bad. Requirements that force me to take and pay for programming that I do not watch.

I know that this argument has been on going. The cable industry always gets what it wants. When will the consumer be first in the considerations of our government commissions?

Mary Jo McConnell

Blab-away for as little as 1¢/min. Make PC-to-Phone Calls using Yahoo! Messenger with Voice.

No. of Copies rec'd 041
List ASODE

5/5/2006

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Michael Peltz [mpeltz@pobox.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 10:22 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

04-207
RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael Peltz (mpeltz@pobox.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I wanted to express my concern about a statement you recently made regarding sports programming at the National Cable and Telecommunications Association. I understand that you stated that there's a big issue with lack of sports programming in the family programming tiers offered by cable and satellite.

What's the issue? This is exactly as it should be. Sports programming is the most expensive programming segment. I don't watch sports and I should not have to pay a sports tax.

It's already a huge problem right now on the base packages that satellite and cable companies offer. They all include ESPN channel plus a few other sports channels, so you end up having to pay a sports tax. If all you want are the local channels plus A&E, Discovery, and TLC, you end up paying more than \$50 per month just for a handful of channels. This is completely absurd considering how expensive sports programming is.

Either you should push the industry in the direction of a la carte or at the very least, sports programming should be considered a premium service just like HBO and other movie channels. If the industry wants to stick with packages, then consumers should have a choice to substitute certain channels for others. For example, if should be able to substitute HBO for ESPN.

Sincerely,

Michael Peltz
1130 Hudson Dr NE
Atlanta, GA 30306
mpeltz@pobox.com

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.236.240.190
Remote IP address: 64.236.240.190

No. of Copies rec'd 091
LIST ABOVE

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: Mary Cook [mcook@reliant.com]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 1:07 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mary Cook (mcook@reliant.com) writes:

I fully support your move toward cable a la carte requirements. As a parent it will make it much easier to handle the many issues that arise due to the amount of inappropriate programming. I have been forced to purchase the expensive broader selection of cable in order to obtain the parent control ability. So I buy it and then turn most of it off. Expensive and not fair to the consumer. In any event, if a show is not worthy of being watched it should not exist. Why support continued substandard and often debased programming?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 158.81.251.201
Remote IP address: 158.81.251.201

No. of Copies rec'd 0 & 1
MAY 5 2006

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Karinne Young [kyoung@newsargus.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 12:01 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

04-207
RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Karinne Young (kyoung@newsargus.com) writes:

I chuckled to read the cable companies' response to offering a la carte service. "Most TV shows don't sell on their own." That speaks volumes about what's wrong with cable, I think. By the way, Time Warner owns our cable franchise and is the only access we have to cable. My bill went from \$28 a month to the \$50+ I pay now, mostly for channels I never watch. Is this fair?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 198.143.233.78
Remote IP address: 198.143.233.78

No. of Copies rec'd 091
LRAALCDE

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: Jill Bauer [JBauer9353@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 10:48 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Jill Bauer (JBauer9353@aol.com) writes:

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Statement of Support
To: FCC Chairman Kevin J. Martin

Thank you so much for the work you are doing to protect children and families from the proliferation of indecent content available on cable and satellite television. Please know of my support for your efforts to research an "a la carte model" of delivery of video programming. I am thankful you have heard the voice of so many who share your concern and believe it is time the American people have a choice in what programming they allow in their homes.

Again, thank you for reexamining the original report released about cable choice and its implications for American families.

Jill Bauer

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 205.188.116.12
Remote IP address: 205.188.116.12

No. of Copies rec'd 081
List ABOVE

Sandra Lyn Bailey

04-207

From: James Rongetti [Jayrron@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 8:04 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

James Rongetti (Jayrron@aol.com) writes: **DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL**

You are on the right track. A lot of cable subscribers get charged for the different sports channels (msg) (yes) (ESPN) and do not watch them, at leaset separate sports and cable prices should go down at least 1/3

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 152.163.100.9
Remote IP address: 152.163.100.9

No. of Copies rec'd 091
DATE 05/05/06

SandraLyn Bailey

04-207

From: David L. Reid [reid_dl@swbell.net]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2006 8:08 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

MAY - 5 2006

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

David L. Reid (reid_dl@swbell.net) writes:

Mr. Chairman,

I urge you to do what you can to give customers the right to pick their own cable and satellite television networks.

The cable and satellite monopolies charge customers a hi fee, then customers do not get to select what they want.

Please give customers freedom of choice at a fair price

thanks

David L. Reid

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.128.127.4
Remote IP address: 70.128.127.4

No. of Copies rec'd
LIST ABOVE

081